

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 09 2007

OFFICIAL  
Expedited Examining Procedure  
Group 3677PATENT  
Docket No. 58328US002IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Leigh E. WOOD et al. ) Group Art Unit: 3677  
Serial No.: 10/674,174 ) Examiner: Ruth C. Rodriguez  
Confirmation No.: 1946 )  
Filed: 29 September 2003 )  
For: CLOSURE SYSTEM AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.116

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed 10 October 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the obviousness rejections of claims 1-3, 7-15, and 29-44 as discussed below.

Claims 1-3, 7-15, and 29-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 669 121 A1 (EP '121) in view of Dilnik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,656,111). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 29-43

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of features recited in claims 29-43 is not taught or suggested by either EP 0 669 121 or Dilnik et al. (alone or in combination). As a result, a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 29-43 has not been presented. Independent claims 31 and 43 both recite a closure system that includes an overlap region in which a portion